DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 420 623 SP 037 982

AUTHOR Cantor, James S.
TITLE Support for the Common Good: Beginning Teachers, Social Justice Education, and School-University Partnerships.
PUB DATE 1998-04-00
NOTE 46p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Diego, CA, April 13-17, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teacher Induction; *Beginning Teachers; *College School Cooperation; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Social Change; Social Cognition; Teacher Attitudes; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS Social Justice

ABSTRACT

This paper summarizes a case study that examined the school-university partnership relationship between UCLA's newly-restructured teacher education program and a nearby school district. The program was designed to develop beginning teachers to become change agents (social justice educators) within urban education. The study probed into the professional lives of four beginning teachers during the first two years of their professional training. The study explored what happens after beginning teachers learn critical, social reconstructivist theory and begin to deal with the cognitive dissonance that often occurs when they have to react to policies and practices, and make sense of their real-life settings. Part 1 of the paper describes four teachers' stories, noting what happened to their beliefs and practices during the induction year. Their stories indicate that it was better for them to begin their careers in school-university partnerships, which offered more support for theory and practice to intersect. All four teachers showed development in becoming knowledgeable about social reconstructivist pedagogical theories. Part 2 presents a theoretical model of an exemplary teacher education program closely connected in a symbiotic relationship with a local district. After offering the vision for an exemplary program and the roles and responsibilities for participants, the paper presents recommendations for extending what was learned to mainstream teacher education programs and suggests how they can benefit from the study and use components from the examples. (Contains 47 references.) (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 420 623

Support For the Common Good: Beginning Teachers, Social Justice Education, and School-University Partnerships

Presented by:

James S. Cantor, Pacific Oaks College

For the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting K-SIG
April 16, 1998, San Diego, CA.

SP037982

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Cantor

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Support For The Common Good: Beginning Teachers, Social Justice Education, and School-University Partnerships

by James S. Cantor

INTRODUCTION

The 1980's and the 1990's have seen a myriad of reform efforts, ranging from constructivist restructuring approaches, to back-to-basics and increased testing. Some examples of the wide range of efforts to improve schooling include decentralized decision-making, parent involvement, professional development schools, school-university partnerships, charter schools, voucher initiatives, class size reduction, and National Standards. Despite all these reform efforts, public schools continue to be under attack on all fronts. Nationwide, people representing the full range of philosophical persuasions, progressives as well as conservatives, criticize the effectiveness of public schooling. In particular, public schools are failing our nation's neediest students[1]. Many scholars believe that the cycles of discrimination, poverty, and hopelessness that often compound the disadvantages of children are exacerbated or perpetuated by urban public schools (Kohl & Witty, 1996; Kozol, 1991; Oakes, 1990). Families send their children to school seeking access to a better life, yet schools are often damaging places for the children who need help the most (Oakes, 1996).

The unspoken reality of our nation's public school system is generally a two-tiered arrangement that is failing to provide even a minimally adequate education to its neediest students, the mostly African-American, and/or Latino, Spanish-speaking

---

[1]When I use the term, "schools of most need," I refer to schools with low income, primarily African-American and/or Latino populations, with large percentages of students whose primary languages are other than English. These are the schools that have trouble filling their vacancies even with long-term substitute teachers. Many of their teachers are inexperienced and untrained, with emergency teaching credentials.

youngsters in the inner-cities. Too often, inner city school workers feel isolated, as they struggle in run-down, ill-equipped, and poorly managed facilities. Rather than being institutions of hope for the poor, these schools have the most difficulty attracting qualified teachers with the skills and inclinations to teach children from oppressed cultures, many of whom are new to the English language and struggling to survive. However, teachers are the most important variable for success. According to the findings reported by The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (National, 1996), the key component in educational reform is insuring a caring, competent, and qualified teacher for every child. Good teachers can make a difference. The Commission asserts that what teachers know and can do is the most important influence on what students learn. Recruiting, preparing, and retaining good teachers, as well as creating the conditions in which teachers can teach, and teach well, can be the most powerful strategy for improving our schools.

Simply improving the pedagogical skills of teaching candidates is not enough. Traditional teacher education programs tend to reinforce isolated, conservative teaching practices and fail to disrupt the unequal conditions which make urban schooling damaging places for many students (Kozol, 1991; Oakes, 1985; Oakes, 1990). Social reconstructivist teacher education programs[2] add a substantive agenda, connecting pedagogy with social justice. They seek to develop a teaching force with the skills and dispositions, not only to teach in these schools of greatest need, but also to be change agents -- social justice educators dedicated to challenging deeply held notions of schooling and society. This approach seeks to disrupt the status quo, and therefore is a minority view, sometimes seen as

[2] Several generations of teacher educators have developed this radical stance (Apple, 1982; Banfield, 1970; Counts, 1932; Freire, 1968; Giroux & McLaren, 1987; Giroux, 1981; Kozol, 1991; Rugg, 1931; Rugg, 1952).

subversive. It is not hard to imagine the many obstacles which stand in the way of bringing social reconstructivist teacher education theory into practice. Nevertheless, there are a small number of schools of education in colleges and universities nationwide, that do support social reconstructivist teacher education. The Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, GSE&IS, at The University of California, Los Angeles, UCLA, is one major research institution that has embraced this approach[3].

This paper provides an analytical summary of the author's recently completed doctoral case study, which examines the school-university partnership relationship between UCLA's Teacher Education Program and a nearby school district. The study pushes social reconstructivist theory beyond a consideration of teacher education classes and probes deeply into the professional lives of four beginning teachers[4] during the first two years of their professional training. It explores the question: What happens after beginning teachers learn critical, social reconstructivist theory and begin to deal with the cognitive dissonance that often occurs when they have to react to policies and practices and make sense of their real-life settings?

Findings confirm recent studies (Su, 1990; Su, 1992) that even though beginning teachers tended to be socialized into the more progressive and liberal beliefs about teaching and schooling on the university campus, once they became engaged in field experiences that were in opposition to their training, they focused on the technical skills of survival, and became re-socialized into the existing,

---

[3]For a history of how GSE&IS transformed its approach to teacher education see (Oakes, 1996).
[4]The terminology changes as beginning teachers progress through their careers. When I refer to the participants as "novice teachers," I will be describing their thoughts or actions from the pre-induction year, commonly referred to as "student teaching." When I refer to the participants as "resident teachers," I will be describing their thoughts or actions from their first year of full-time teaching in their own classrooms. When I label them "beginning teachers" it is a general statement about teachers who are not veterans.

conservative culture of teaching. Those who were teaching in partnership schools were more able to retain the constructivist, collaborative practices from their university training. This implies that changes can be made to support beginning teachers as social justice educators, but it requires strong commitments to building and nurturing relationships, aimed at linking individual self-interests with collaborative activities to promote the common good.

This paper is organized in two parts. Part One tells a slice of each of the stories of the four beginning teachers. The reader will see samplings of what happened to their beliefs and practices during the induction year. Their stories indicate that it was better for the beginning teachers to begin their careers in school-university partnerships. These environments offered more support for theory and practice to intersect. In Part Two, I use what I have learned from this study and develop my vision, a brief illustration of a teacher education program closely connected in a symbiotic relationship with a local district. Not all teacher education programs have the support of a school-university partnership. In fact, very few teaching candidates have the opportunity to participate in such enriched training, so it is important to extend the analysis. After offering my vision for an exemplary program, as well as the roles and responsibilities of the participants, I will offer recommendations for extending these learnings to mainstream teacher education programs, those more realistically endowed, and suggest how they too can benefit from this study and use components from this vision.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The teacher education program that is the focus of this study is aligned with the social reconstructivist approach to teacher education (Liston & Zeichner, 1991; Sleeter, 1987; Zeichner & Hoeft, 1996). This tradition considers diversity as a resource and advocates examining and critiquing institutional racism and personal

attitudes as a means of educating teachers to facilitate more equitable and democratic education for *all* children. Teacher educators have long been attempting to socialize beginning teachers to confront injustice (Rugg, 1931), however, this continues to be a minority view and most teacher education programs keep on preparing teachers to fit in with existing practices (Zeichner & Gore, 1990).

All beginning teachers face numerous difficulties, and would benefit from broad-based support systems (Gold, 1996), as they attempt to become effective in this challenging profession. Beginning social justice educators need even more intensive support in order for them to overcome the overwhelming obstacles that they face as change agents attempting to confront the status quo. This commitment to a critical, social justice, social reconstructivist perspective is likely to run counter to the ideas beginning teachers face in the field placements where they are trained. Neophyte teachers who see themselves as outside and against the status quo compound the challenges facing them as they struggle to simultaneously learn their profession as well as change its norms. Marilyn Cochran-Smith likens the process of constructing knowledge about race and teaching as

> more akin to building a new boat while sitting in the old one, surrounded by rising waters. In this kind of construction process, it is not clear how or if the old pieces can be used in the new "boat," and there is no blueprint for what the new one is supposed to look like. It is also not clear whether the new boat will float, hold the weight of its builder, or hold back the water. And, of course, as one is trying to build the new boat, one is stuck inside the old one, struggling to negotiate tricky waters, not to mention rapids, hidden rocks, and unpredictable currents (Cochran-Smith, 1995b, p. 553).

The possibilities for successful development of beginning teachers to be social justice educators become greater when there is communication and collaboration between school practitioners and university educators. A promising structure for supporting the development of beginning social justice educators is the

professional development school/school-university partnership model, articulated by the Holmes Group, John Goodlad, and others (Book, 1996; Darling-Hammond, 1994; Goodlad, 1990; Holmes, 1990; Valli, Cooper, Frankes, & Zeichner, 1997). I argue that there is the potential for a synergy to develop when schools and universities collaborate to promote school-based inquiry (Oakes, Beck, & Mitchell, 1996), and promote teachers as social justice educators.

The process of inquiry is essentially when school practitioners join with outsiders to develop explanations and understandings of existing school practices, with the goal of changing and renewing schools to bring about equally high-level outcomes for *all* students. For school communities to "acquire self-knowledge and negotiate good decisions... (entails) examination of and reflection upon the thoughts, emotions, intentions, and actions of individuals and groups" (Heckman, Confer, & Peacock, 1995, p. 194). Importance is placed in first examining the basis upon which actions and judgments are made before focusing on the act. It is based on the premise that improving the teaching/learning process requires a sufficient understanding of relevant features of the context within which the process takes place (Sirotnik & Oakes, 1986). Inquiry is a process designed to foster social change, and it involves all constituents from the community which it effects. It offers the possibility that those who work in schools have a very real opportunity to influence the changes they believe should be made (Wasley, King, & Louth, 1995). Schools and universities collaborating to promote school-based inquiry involves a shift from a culture biased strongly in favor of individualism, towards an emerging communitarian perspective. By promoting an alteration of norms and a shifting of thinking towards the common good, social justice educators create new spaces of bi-directional learning (Ochs, 1991) -- communities of learners (Gutierrez & Meyer, 1995; Rogoff, 1990).

DESIGN & INSTRUMENTS

I have taken a participatory, collaborative, and holistic approach to conducting an exploratory case study. Beginning teachers participated in the inquiry by sharing with me their reflections through interviews and written documents. Together, we built understandings, valuing the investigator and the co-participants as the primary data-gathering instruments. This way the participants can observe and interpret while interacting with others in the inquiry process (Hunkins, Wiseman, & Williams, 1995; Reason, 1994).

Lincoln & Guba (1985) characterize this as collaborative inquiry, a process where investigators allow the design of the inquiry to evolve from the needs revealed as the study progresses (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). There is no search for absolute truth, but rather for more information and understanding. All parties are part of a question driven, collaborative process that is dynamic, uncertain, playful, contextual, and emergent (Hunkins et al., 1995). Collaborative inquiry brings into congruence my world-view and the constructivist theoretical framework of the teacher education program that the subjects of my study are participating in.

This holistic view is expressed by Dudley (1992), as a new paradigm of inquiry which encompasses ideas of collaboration, process, participation, and reflexivity. Grounded in phenomenology and feminist theory, Dudley describes her relationship with those she studied as a natural one of co-researchers (Dudley, 1992). In order to assure that these findings would be indicative of what really was in the minds of these beginning teachers, I constructed questions that were open-ended, and I was careful to keep to a minimum direct questions about social justice education. I asked these beginning teachers to talk or write about significant issues that arose in conversation or thought about daily practice. In this way I was able to tell the story of their social development and the presence or absence of social justice ideals and practices.

Data collection came from three major sources: 1) interviews with the beginning teachers, their principals, and other participants in the partnership; 2) observation and participation; and 3) documents written by the participants, documents related to the program, and miscellaneous data sources. In-depth, semi-structured interviews, at various points in time, allowed the beginning teachers to give voice and reflect upon their experiences. They also responded to a reflective journal template that I provided with three open-ended questions, and they forward to me copies of written reflections from personal journals, UCLA seminars, and school site instruments. Another rich source was the final Masters portfolios each beginning teacher produced as part of their program requirements.

PART ONE: THEIR STORIES

Contextual Background

One of the results from the aftermath of the uprisings in Los Angeles was that The University of California, Los Angeles, UCLA, restructured its professional education programs with the goal of making them more effective in confronting conditions of urban schooling. Besides clearly articulating its alignment with social reconstructivist teacher education, The Graduate School of Education and Information Studies at UCLA reorganized and unified its pre-service and the in-service arms and established a new unit, Center X -- Where Research and Practice Intersect for Urban School Professionals. One of the first projects of Center X was to restructure its teacher education program from a one-year program into a two-year program, with the intention of developing beginning teachers to become change agents -- social justice educators.

I have conducted a two-year, longitudinal case study on the development of the beliefs and practices of four beginning teachers who were part of that first cohort. These beginning teachers began their training as participant-observers and later

novice teachers in The Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District, SMMUSD, a school district that had a partnering relationship with the university. A major change from traditional student teaching experiences is that each novice teacher stayed at one school for most of their year-long pre-induction experience. They visited a few other schools and served several short stints observing, but each had a home base where they became part of a school community for the entire school year. A developmental approach was taken by scaffolding increasing teaching responsibilities. Each novice teacher participated school-wide in the life of the school community, and student teaching was conducted in different classes on the same campus. In this way they experienced what it is to be a part of a school community for one full school year.

TABLE #1: THE PARTICIPANTS

Name	Gender	Ethnicity	Novice Teaching Placement	Novice Teaching Grade Level	Resident Teaching Placement	Resident Teaching Grade Level
Nancy	female	Asian	Ocean School House, SMMUSD	K-1-2 multi-age	Meadowlands School, Inglewood S.D.	2nd Grade
Lucy	female	Caucasian	Ocean School House, SMMUSD	K-1-2 multi-age	Ansel Adams Elementary, SMMUSD	1-2 multi-age
Lois	female	Caucasian	Ocean School House, SMMUSD	3-4-5 multi-age	Meadowlands School, Inglewood S.D.	3rd Grade
Tina	female	Caucasian	John Dewey Learning Community, SMMUSD	1-2, bilingual multi-age	John Dewey Learning Community, SMMUSD	1-2, bilingual multi-age

As Table #1 indicates, three of the novices spent that year at Ocean School House, The Santa Monica Alternative School House, a progressive K - 8 school of 190 students. Nancy, Lucy, and Lois experienced pre-induction training in this school where multi-age, team-teaching, and thematic, learning for understanding are actual, implemented practices. Nancy and Lucy student taught as team-mates in a K-1-2 class of 64 students and 2 teachers. Following the model of their cooperating teachers, Nancy and Lucy spent long hours as supportive teaching partners, working and planning together. Lois was in a 3-4-5 class where a veteran teacher team-taught with a first-year teacher who graduated from the same university program and student taught at Ocean School House when the partnership was in its pilot stage. Tina's pre-induction year was at the same school where she was later hired for her residency -- John Dewey Learning Community, an award-winning school, highly recognized for its advances in restructuring and collaboration with university research.

After the novice teaching experience, teacher candidates were expected to contact school districts and secure teaching positions as credentialed, self-contained, fully-employed teachers. There was one stipulation. Honoring its commitment to social justice education, the university required that placements be limited to schools that met specific socio-economic and racial criteria. At least half of the school population had to qualify for government free lunch program and no more than 49% of the population could be categorized as white. The partnering schools in Santa Monica had diverse, mixed populations that met these qualifications, but due to the limited number of openings, teaching candidates had to search beyond this school district for residency placements.

All four beginning teachers secured teaching positions in grades that were similar to their novice teaching experiences. However, two of them, Lucy and Tina,

remained as resident teachers in the collaborating district, and the other two teachers, Lois and Nancy, were hired in the neighboring Inglewood School District. Inglewood's student population was homogeneous -- primarily African-American, and the district leadership promoted teaching practices which were vastly different, and in some ways opposed to the philosophy and pedagogy that these beginning teachers were trained in.

To summarize the difference in residency placements, Tina and Lucy remained in a progressive school district with a diverse student population. The Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District was actively in partnership with UCLA's Center X, exploring the notion of professional development school/school-university partnership, PDS/SUP. Lois and Nancy became first-year teachers in a school district with a low-income, minority population. Santa Monica was promoting restructuring, school-university partnership, authentic assessment, and learning for understanding. Inglewood's concerns were more fundamental -- campus safety and cleanliness, literacy, basic skills, and improved scores on standardized tests.

The support the beginning teachers received in the second year of their teacher education program, (the residency year) included site visits with observation and consultation from a "team leader" from the university, as well as continued university classes and seminars. Their culminating project was the construction of a Master's Portfolio reflecting on the intersection of theory and practice. These documents were especially helpful as I refined my cross-case analysis of how beginning teachers evolve and change their reasoning about social justice issues. A vision emerged as I developed understandings about what happened after these beginning teachers learned critical, social-reconstructivist theory and began to deal with the cognitive dissonance that occurred when they had to react to the policies and practices of public school life and make sense of their real-life settings. Before I present what I learned from this study, and in particular, how teacher education

programs can best support beginning teachers to be social justice educators, I will highlight, very briefly the salient findings from each case.[5]

Nancy

According to the end-of-the-year evaluation written by her cooperating teacher, Nancy had an "extremely successful" novice teaching year at Ocean School House. The evaluation describes how Nancy was able to modify her instruction to account for multiple intelligences and contribute to a positive learning environment for all 64 children in the multi-age, team-taught, K-1-2 class. Here are some excerpts from the evaluation.

> Throughout her student teaching, Nancy has consistently improved in her classroom management techniques. Positive reinforcement now appears second nature to her, and the students both respect and adore her as a teacher... Nancy, with her novice teaching partner, has researched and written her own curriculum on... thematic units... Her love for learning and teaching is contagious and sets the tone for the whole class... Nancy is an active participant in the school community... extremely reflective and has continuously discussed and implemented ways on how to improve as a teacher... Nancy appears to be a life-long learner who will always strive for professional development and growth... Nancy has both encouraged and modeled respect for others in the classroom... and she has established many ways for parents and other family members to assist in the learning. Community resources have greatly supplemented her curriculum... Nancy's nurturing personality, gentle demeanor, and intelligent wit have made her a wonderful presence in the classroom (Jenny, Cooperating Teacher).

A year later, at the end of her residency year at Meadow Brook School in Inglewood, Nancy's self-evaluation was bleak.

> I have felt very alone and hopeless... Most days, I end the school day very disappointed, exhausted, and emotionally broken. I leave for home as soon as possible. I do not spend any more time at the school than is necessary. My experiences there are so negative and draining. I practically rush to leave every afternoon. Extra time spent there simply drains me even more. I do not

[5]For in-depth case studies of each of these beginning teachers, please refer to their individual chapters in my doctoral dissertation (Cantor, 1997).

> have the energy to stay after school for staff meetings... My effectiveness as a teacher was greatly limited by lack of support. Without the support, I spent all of my energy and emotions on classroom management and trying to understand what it is that drives these students to be so disrespectful and cruel... I have come to the realization that I need to be in a learning community that provides all the necessary supports and where I can feel good about myself and what I am doing for students. Otherwise, my energies and motivations will be wasted, and my well being and beliefs will be sacrificed.

Nancy, a Korean-American teaching African-Americans, did not respond successfully in her residency year at Inglewood. She describes how hard it was for her to transcend cultural boundaries, indicating the need for more preparation in this area.

> Teaching in an environment where I am from a different culture than my school community has reinforced the importance of looking at social and cultural aspects of students' lives. Because I was a complete outsider to my students' real lives, I did not know how to relate to them or how to help them deal with the school culture and the structures prescribed by it. Now that I have reached the end of the school year, I still feel like an outsider to my students' real lives. I know their likes, dislikes, hobbies, and attitudes, but I still feel as though I cannot understand them as people. I cannot understand their motives to act so mean and violently to each other. I do not feel a sense of connection between us -- a sense of respect and common interest. Perhaps I cannot feel this connection or understanding because I am not a part of their African-American or community culture (Master's Portfolio).

Teaching people who are not like ourselves in culture, race, and ethnicity is a huge challenge and important research is being done to learn more about how to help teacher educators be more effective in preparing beginning teachers to be successful when faced with assignments in schools of most need (Cochran-Smith, 1995b). As Nancy's beliefs about being a social justice educator diminished, she abandoned connecting theory with practice, and quickly retreated into a survival mode.

> *(Interview during resident teaching year at Inglewood.)* Just the mention of "social justice educator" turns me off. We were heavily immersed into this idea (last year) during the Fall Quarter of our classes, and it is frequently

referred to by UCLA staff... They have defined it for us clearly. I do not agree with this idea of a social justice educator. I don't think a term such as "social justice educator" is necessary. I don't think the main purpose of schooling is to focus on race, ethnicity, or other political issues. I think it should focus on basically helping children become "all that you can be," (as the U.S. Army says), and that is done through good teaching. I think good teaching should include many things. There are so many... I can't list them all now, but they include creating an environment in which all students are given many rich opportunities to learn and be excited by learning. The classroom environment should provide support and encouragement to students to speak their opinions and be their own decision-makers -- the makers of their own happiness and success.

(Reflective Journal Entry, while teaching at Inglewood, 11/15/96.) Last Tuesday, I had a great cry. It was truly overdue. From that day on, I've felt better because I made a decision to concentrate on my own survival rather than on whether the kids are learning anything. I go to school and spend my time there simply trying to survive. I never thought I'd be the type of teacher to just baby-sit students, but that is basically what I am now doing. I'll have to live with that for now. I need to -- for my own sake. Last Tuesday afternoon, there was only a very short thread of my conscience that kept me there. The other 99.9% of me was about to walk into (the principal), Mrs. Post's office and give a notice of my resignation... Never in my wildest dreams did I imagine teaching here to be this difficult. Up until several days ago, I hated my job and I hated my kids. Now I have a different focus, and one of my worst behavioral problems is gone. I still do not like what I am doing, and I still hate a lot of the kids... It's hard to believe that I was once capable of being such a positive and enthusiastic teacher.

(Master's Portfolio Entry) As a first year teacher in an urban setting, I did not use (teacher education program) theories to guide my thoughts and practices. The theories of social reproduction, biculturalism, and cultural capital in no way affected my thoughts or decisions about curriculum or instruction. My thoughts were focused on how to achieve community and a sense of discipline and respect in my classroom, rather than on how to expose the students to a wider range of careers, options, and cultures. When reflecting upon these theories and how they relate to both my school community and my teaching practice, I realize that perhaps in many ways, I am not helping to prevent social reproduction, to expand their cultural capital, or to aid the mediation process of their developing biculturalism.

These data indicate that early in her residency year Nancy had already lost her self confidence, self-esteem, and her connection with the social reconstructivist

teaching practices and beliefs from her first year of training. It is clear that Nancy needed more scaffolding and training before being placed in such a challenging assignment. Qualitative research has given me an opportunity to develop deep understandings about Nancy's inner psyche. This is a level of understanding that one cannot expect supervisors in teacher education programs to develop with their students. Although I do not have any training as a psychoanalyst, I can recognize that Nancy was grappling with trying to resolve two conflicting conceptions about teaching. She often stated that her beliefs were aligned with Center X's constructivist approach, yet she quietly held on to her individualistic beliefs and passively kept them in the background. Nancy failed to credit individual families for their circumstances, and this may be a key to learning why she could not understand her children and implement the curriculum. Nancy may not have been aware that she often characterized her students' families and their values as deficient. At one point she did express that these people do need to learn from the dominant culture because that is where the power is. She wanted her children to aspire to more than the "same standard of living as their parents did."

Nancy's story indicates that she did not focus on the structural constrains that effected the lives of her students. Instead of inquiring into the importance of race, structure, and recognizing differences, Nancy gave up hope in her children and their families. These are important issues that need to be examined when teacher education program classes focus on issues of institutional racism and anti-bias curriculum. Teacher education students can improve their abilities to teach in low-income, multi-cultural settings by delving deeply into their own backgrounds, examining their own preconceptions, and being required on an on-going basis to articulate personal and cultural beliefs about teaching, schooling, and social justice education.

Lucy

Although Lucy remained as a teacher in the partnering school district, she did not feel that Ansel Adams School was aligned with her personal beliefs nor the pedagogical tenants of her teacher education program, in the ways that Ocean School House was. She believed that this disjuncture prevented her from implementing constructivist, active learning and alternative assessment strategies. At the end of her resident year she compared structures, beliefs, and practices from Ocean School House and Ansel Adams.

> To them (Ocean School House teachers), non-traditional, collaborative assessments are routine and familiar, and the returning students (in the K-1-2, multi-age class) help as role models... I encounter many obstacles as I implement such informal, collaborative assessments in my current classroom (at Ansel Adams). At my new school, the assumption about learning is that the teacher is the knowledgeable one who will fill the student, the "empty vessel," with information. The students are comfortable with timed, paper-driven tests. They see collaboration as cheating. This makes completing a team assignment much more difficult since there are tensions between my continual prodding to put them in collaborative roles and their deference to individual regurgitation of information the teacher has "taught" them (Master's Portfolio).

Lucy never bonded with her new school. She was troubled that the school persisted in maintaining individualistic and traditional norms of pedagogy and management. She craved a more collaborative environment, and thus resisted much of the support that the current situation offered. She survived the year with no intention of returning the following year. She even considered leaving the teaching profession. Amazingly, Ocean School House had two openings in the same K-1-2 where she team-taught with Nancy, and they *both* were hired to fill those positions. Lucy is now working collaboratively in a school that is aligned with her beliefs, and she is team-teaching with one of her original guiding teachers, and her original partner, Nancy.

Lois

Lois suffered greatly with cognitive dissonance during her residency at Inglewood. She was continually disturbed that her practices were in opposition to her training. She resented having to implement a phonics-based, scripted literacy program, which dictated grouping children by ability level.

> The situation could be dismal. The restrictions placed by the Open Court language arts program would not allow students to work at the top of a zone of proximal development or give them room to work with the teacher or one another to set individual goals and make curriculum decisions. (Master's Portfolio).

Lois understood theoretically that tracking is a harmful practice, but she soon became socialized into the existing school culture and began to believe that de-tracking might not be a good idea at a school like Meadow Brook.

> It is logical to think that tracking does have a negative effect on students in lower tracks. Not only are these students taught to think that they are "less capable," but they are rarely challenged academically. This results in programming most of these students for academic mediocrity and some for academic failure. However, de-tracking in my third grade elementary classroom at Meadow Brook School in Inglewood has been difficult and sometimes impossible (Master's Portfolio).

Since Lois reverted to conservative beliefs and practices regarding classroom management and ability grouping, it follows that her beliefs about social justice education might also change. I wondered if she would think that progressive and constructivist pedagogy is only good for *some* students in *some* schools? Would she think that *these* children are *not yet ready* for cooperative learning and thematically planned whole language instruction? In late Spring I asked her to describe the ways her beliefs about social justice education, schooling, and the teaching profession have changed during this residency year. Like Lucy and Nancy, Lois asserted that she still held to the social reconstructivist beliefs, but that it takes an entire community to support these efforts. She insisted that is not realistic or

proper to send individuals or even small cohorts of resident teachers into schools that are not aligned and mobilized to support these aims. Her frustration was so strong during the interview that she could not complete her thoughts.

> I have become more cognizant that a teacher can go into a school with ideals about social justice education, but none of these things are going to happen until the schools, the parents, the administration and the districts... ... ... My district just fired the superintendent Its insane!!! They are not helping the children at all. Its not in touch with reality. You need the cooperation of everybody involved to foster social justice education. Not just a single teacher. I thought before that I could go in and be a social justice educator, but I can't because I'm constricted by these outside things that are flowing in the opposite direction and we need to be moving together in the same ways (Lois, April interview, residency year).

Lois concluded that she was isolated and ineffectual, and like Nancy, she felt inadequate. "What this boils down to is that I have often felt helpless and as if I was the only true advocate for my students this year." After acknowledging in her Master's Portfolio that she had positively effected some students, Lois poignantly described how she was not able to incorporate the substantive social justice agenda into her practice.

> I have not been a change agent. I have not helped my students to become academic successes. I have not taught my students that violence is not a good answer, or how to flourish in a caring community. I have, in effect, maintained the status quo at Meadow Brook. I know which of my students will probably end up in jail or dead. I know which ones will probably not graduate from high school. I know which ones have great potential to escape poverty and manual labor that they will probably never live up to. I should not know any of these things. I should have been able to say that none of my students will belong in gangs, that they will all graduate from high school, live up to their potential.
>
> But I cannot say these things, and it makes me sad. I have not been a change agent, or even a good teacher. I have tried, but I have failed. Maybe I ask for the impossible, but I don't think so. I have seen schools which have made changes, that could say positive things about the futures of their students. But these schools had created communities, and they did have staffs who worked together for common goals.

> UCLA wants to create social justice educators. UCLA has tried to mold me into a social justice educator. But I am not a social justice educator! How can I be when I can identify which of my students are headed for gangs and death? How can I be when I maintain the status quo? How can I be when I pass illiterate students on to the fourth grade? How can I be when I promote social reproduction through my practices?
>
> It was impossible for me to be a social justice educator this year because I wasn't in a social justice school or community. If I had gone to a school that supported social justice values, then I might have succeeded. UCLA is faced with a difficult dilemma: If you create social justice educators, can they only be effective in social justice schools? Perhaps the solution is for UCLA to create stronger bonds with more inner-city schools and districts (as they have with Santa Monica) work together with these schools in the effort to build social justice communities.

Lois pinpoints a key issue. More research is needed to help social reconstructivist teacher education programs resolve this tension. We know the importance of supporting beginning teachers as social justice educators, by placing them in learning communities that are in partnership with the university, and aligned with mission. Tina's experience provides an illustration of this type of successful experience in a community of learners. We understand the benefits of keeping beginning teachers in the same school so that they can become part of a school community for a significant amount of time. We have learned that PDS/SUP is a promising model for schools and teacher education program renewal, and this model needs continued commitment. We also know that we need to provide training and support for beginning teachers to have the skills and inclinations to teach in the schools of greatest need, and that these schools tend to be organized around the kind of structures and beliefs that we want to change away from. Beginning teachers being trained as social justice educators need first-hand experiences in these schools as well as in the exemplary schools. Otherwise, they are in for a big surprise when they leave their university training and venture out into these schools of greatest need. Lois and Nancy have shown us what can happen to work against these social justice goals. Continued study is needed so that these types of teacher

education programs improve and beginning teachers are supported, in the schools of greatest need, and in ways that assist them to become the change agents and effective teachers they hope to be. As for Lois, after the school year was over, she went on an extended business trip with her husband, and she did not immediately seek a teaching position for the next school year. In the Fall Lois and her husband relocated to the San Francisco Bay Area, and she accepted a second grade teaching assignment in a public school.

Tina

> The African proverb that "It takes a whole village to raise a child" is how my school thinks of in terms of supporting the needs of a child. We are a whole community of learners who are creating expectations and opportunities with students so that each one knows people are concerned and caring about them. By bringing an entire community into my classroom, I am learning to bring out much more for each child (Master's Portfolio).

All of the beginning teachers in this study deeply realize that change agency is not an individual task. Tina stayed at the same school for both her novice teaching and her residency years, and she took full advantage of the supportive, collegial relationships with peers and colleagues in her progressive school community. She often described Dewey as a collaborative community working together to construct socially just educational experiences for all of its students.

> The whole school is in partnership. It can't just be the (resident and faculty) people from our program who are trying to effect change. Its just not going to happen. It just stays in the classroom. The whole school is committed to understanding, not necessarily implementing, but understanding what the differences are and seeing what changes could be made. Then I think that something might happen.

At the end of her residency year Tina described her two years of collegial involvement at Dewey Learning Community and how trusting relationships help build her competencies and make her feel secure and successful.

> I can't even begin to name them all!!! I team teach with other teachers so right there I am involved in collegial practices. We meet in grade level teams, have grade level peers who observe one another in classrooms, meet in houses where we span grades 1-5, and do many activities that include all teachers. Also, we have inquiry, which allows for more deeply professional discussions which then provides a further basis for collegial relationships. Of the many schools I've heard of, I think ours is one of the most advanced in terms of providing collegial activities. It makes me feel as if no one is hiding anything. That way I can determine that even if I may be behind some teachers, I am not out of the ballpark. I feel that I can trust what is going on in other classes, and thus trust myself to do what is right in my own class. It makes me feel more secure in my professional practices... As discussed MANY times before, my school environment allows me to feel both secure in my place as teacher, as well as a life-long learner. I believe that the teachers, staff, and colleagues at the school go a long ways towards making me feel as if I am accomplishing something positive with my students, thus allowing me to feel comfortable enough to push myself.

Tina devoted most of her Master's Portfolio to analyzing the virtues of her school -- her learning community. She depicted how the teachers at Dewey Learning Community were unified in developing constructivist teaching practices. She became determined to instantiate the same community-building practices in her classroom.

> The students at Dewey Learning Community are working with the teachers so they can become eloquent in voicing their opinions, ideas, and beliefs... In our class, for instance, students have become the key to the way the units will be developing in the school year. Rather than simply determining what the students know and what they will learn by the end of the unit, they are deciding with the teachers, the direction of the units, based on previous knowledge, current expectations, and future aspirations.

Although Nancy, Lucy, and Lois expressed that the theories did not inform their practices during their residency year, Tina, on the other hand, had the support and continuity of a school community engaged in these theories. In her Master's Portfolio, Tina summarized the ways theory informs her practice.

> As I have learned to grow with the students, I have also determined that the theories we have and the practice we use are bi-directional. That is the theories highlight the importance of instructional decisions, teaching goals and strategies in practice, and the practice authenticates the theory to

> validate it to people who are unfamiliar with the theory. Having a theory available to me for something that occurs in the classroom gives me a higher level of comfort in continuing the practice. For instance, I am considered a "Novice" as a Spanish speaker compared to my students. They are my "experts," and in seeing that Elinor Ochs (Ochs, 1991) believes that there are times for a novice to be an expert and vice versa, especially in student-teacher relationships, I see just how positive a practice it is... The most productive intellectual growth occurred when I had the dependable support system of my cohort. But were I alone and simply thinking about what I was doing in the classroom it was very rarely that I took the time to consider how my practice fit into the realm of "educational theory." (Tina, Master's Portfolio).

It is significant that the synergistic relationship between Tina's school and university, combined with her complimentary personal background, resulted in this beginning teacher feeling efficacious and able to carry out social reconstructivist, social justice education. All the pieces came together so that Tina habitually took advantage of her exemplary situation, and felt she was able to "try everything I can to help every student who enters my classroom succeed in life." Tina's case is a rare example of a "best case scenario." Teacher educators can use this as an ideal, something that certainly cannot be replicated in the majority of our inner city public schools at this time, but still useful in developing understandings about teacher education. Tina remained at Dewey the year after her residency, confident to continue her work with veteran and novice teachers collaborating in social justice education. The Santa Monica district continued its evolving collaborative relationship with Center X. In Part Two I will offer my conclusions and recommendations for supporting the development of beginning teachers as social justice educators.

PART TWO: TACKLING THE URBAN SCHOOL CRISIS

> As the United States moves from a simpler society dominated by a manufacturing economy to a much more complex world based largely on information technologies and knowledge work, its schools are undergoing a

> once-in-a-century transformation. Never before has the success, perhaps even the survival, of nations and people been so tightly tied to their ability to learn (Darling-Hammond, 1997, p. 1).

Providing a thinking education for all students is a difficult matter requiring sophisticated teaching. Growing numbers of policy makers and educational researchers agree with Linda Darling-Hammond that today's teachers need to know their students well in order to meet their diverse needs. They also need to maintain up-to-date knowledge of the subjects they teach. Beginning teachers are not only faced with a more demanding profession requiring deep knowledge of both subjects and students, they are also confronted by a powerful social and political establishment who may be threatened by children of color from low-income families being educated to think independently and question the rules that govern the social order. Teacher educators need to intensify their efforts to support these special young people who accept this challenge -- to become beginning teachers, as well as change agents in the vanguard of a model of teaching that few of us have experienced ourselves.

> The critical role that the university can play is that of assisting new and future teachers in acquiring the training to analyze their teaching, to evaluate their work with students, to anticipate the needs of their students, and to provide a variety of ways of meeting students' needs." (Gold, 1996, p. 581)

Reconstructing schools in socially just ways implies that beginning teachers be in the forefront of an anti-establishment model of teaching that few of us have experienced ourselves. It is to the advantage of small experimental teacher education programs to be selective in admitting candidates who are predisposed to embracing the moral dimensions of teaching. It also must be noted that teacher education programs in larger institutions do not have this luxury. In fact, teacher education programs at state colleges that serve inner cities are overwhelmed with the task of providing training for the many new teachers that are currently working as

emergency credentialed teachers. Class size reduction, (especially in California), created a situation where schools of education cannot be overly selective as they accept the call for providing on-the-job training for untrained, unqualified teachers already in classrooms and schools of greatest need.

In addition to beginning teachers' predispositions exerting a powerful socializing influence, what teachers know and can do makes the crucial difference in what children learn, and the ways school systems organize their work makes a big difference in what teachers can accomplish (National, 1996). Potentially, teacher education programs can positively effect the beliefs and practices of beginning teachers. Professional development school/school-university partnerships do provide promising structures to promote and facilitate change. It is important that teacher education programs are effective because the imprinting that occurs during the first teaching experiences have a strong effect on future practices and on longevity in the profession (Gold & Roth, 1993). Too often beginning teachers acclimate to conservative practices in the schools rather than implementing the learnings from their more progressive university training.

Nancy's, Lois', and Lucy's stories indicate that social justice issues were not a major priority for these beginning teachers, who were not in exemplary settings. Survival was. The issue then becomes learning ways to support beginning teachers' primal needs in order for them to be open, amenable, and competent enough to embrace being social justice educators. All of the beginning teachers in this case study named community and collaboration as the most important factors in establishing conditions for supporting beginning teachers, and they endorsed inquiry as an effective process for relationship building, as well as for changing beliefs and practices.

School-university partnerships and professional development schools can be an effective way to bridge theory and practice and promote continuous examination

of institutional purpose, roles, and responsibilities. Professional development schools promote exemplary school settings and offer real-life enactment of theory in multi-directional, dialectical, and democratic interactions of critical, and collaborative inquiry as part of the school-university culture. When they were novice teachers, Lois, Lucy, Nancy, and Tina continued to develop their beliefs in synchrony with their teacher education program, and they began to teach in socially reconstructivist ways. Their initial supervised field experiences were in collaborative learning communities, engaged in school-based inquiry, within the supportive atmosphere of a PDS/SUP. The connection of the schools and the university in collegial relationship made a significant impact on whether or not these beginning teachers retained the beliefs and practices from their university training. These data indicate that strong school-university connections can result in beginning teachers developing as reflective practitioners, inclined to pursue their roles as change agents engaged in social justice education. This study also shows how beginning teachers can lose their dedication and drive once they encounter culture shock and cognitive dissonance and begin to work in urban schools that are organized in traditional, individualistic and autocratic structures.

All of the beginning teachers in this case study showed commendable development in becoming knowledgeable about social reconstructivist pedagogical theories. Their Master's Portfolios are outstanding examples of how they successfully integrated the constructivist theories from their teacher education program into their belief systems and engaged these theories in scaffolded and supervised practical experiences. The fact that they were favorably predisposed to social justice education before admission to the program contributed to the auspicious conditions enabling these beginning teachers to articulately and thoughtfully analyze their practices in relation to the theories that they were schooled in. They wanted to change schooling for low-income, African-American and/or

Latino children, and they believed that by becoming part of progressive and collaborative school cultures they could develop their pedagogical skills in order to meet the challenge.

These data clearly illustrate Dewey Learning Community as a model for future change, aligned with social reconstructivist pedagogical theory. Meadow Brook School exemplifies what social justice educators are trying to change from. Ansel Adams Elementary School is a school in transition, inquiring into their practices and attempting to create conditions that promote change. This study is important because it shows that supporting beginning teachers to be social justice educators can be done in large public schools with diverse racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic populations. Schools can create the conditions to change their practices which lead to whole learning communities focused on success for *all* students. These learning communities, in partnership with universities, can be fertile ground for nurturing beginning teachers as social justice educators. This study also shows the powerful challenges that confront teacher education programs when they attempt to develop relationships with schools and support them in collaborative change efforts.

Three of the four beginning teachers in this study did not have positive experiences in their residency placements and failed to develop as social justice educators. They did not feel that there was support, communication, and collaboration between their school and their university. They felt that their school community was stagnant and resistant to change instead of one that continuously examines institutional purpose, roles, and responsibilities. I will now discuss the implications that emerge from this failure, and offer suggestions for future research, so that attention can be focused on learning more about building up the capacities of beginning teachers and creating the conditions favorable for them to become social justice educators.

Addressing the Needs of the Profession

What this all boils down to is that successfully nurturing the development of beginning teachers as social justice educators requires serious dedication of resources, including real faculty resources, in the creation and sustenance of partnerships. These partnerships have to be deep, consistent, and inquiry-based. In addition, successful preparation and induction of teachers with a social justice agenda can occur if another round of enormous resources is placed on their personal and professional growth. All of this suggests that given the current political and economic climate, very few institutions are going to be able or want to bring all of these elements into their teacher education programs.

This leads to the final two issues which I will address in this paper. 1) What is the role of these small, alternative, experimental teacher education programs, supported by large research institutions and PDS/SUPs? And what is the role of a few, well trained, hand-made, social justice/change agent/beginning teachers? Perhaps it is not realistic to expect broad-based implementation of the recommendations from this study because it requires such a deep amount of resources. Why then is it so important that at least a small core of beginning teachers have this exemplary training experience? Assuming that I will make a strong case for, and illustrate the possibilities for such an intensive program, the next question becomes: 2) How do we make components of this specialized, privileged program accessible to other teacher educators to assist their efforts in teacher training and professional development, even if they cannot, or choose not to implement all of the recommendations?

The current shortage of well trained, qualified, certificated teachers, combined with the move to reduce class size in lower elementary classrooms, have stimulated a number of alternative avenues for teacher preparation. California's class size reduction initiative is an example of a policy that has resulted in vastly increasing the

number of untrained, or minimally trained teachers teaching in public schools on emergency credentials. In a recent article Linda Darling Hammond reports.

> In recent years, more than 50,000 people who lack the training required for their jobs entered teaching annually on emergency or substandard licenses (Darling-Hammond, 1998, p. 6)[6].

In response to this need, teacher education programs are quickly offering "fast-track" alternative routes, such as internship programs that seek to provide intensive teacher training preparation in a shorter time frame, and then provide on-the-job professional development during the induction period. It addresses the need to quickly put teachers with at least some training in the classrooms, yet paradoxically, provides less training than traditional programs, at a time when we know that more and more training is needed. Current staffing practices often result in the teachers with the least amount of training and experience being assigned to the most challenging schools and classrooms. This means that the children who are most disadvantaged, at the most needy schools, and present the greatest challenges, are often taught by the least qualified, emergency credentialled or intern teachers.

An immediate challenge for teacher educators is to develop deeper understandings of the lives of these beginning teachers and to learn better ways of helping them succeed in these challenging placements. We must take advantage of every opportunity to go beyond theory and actually develop, in fertile environments, social justice educators/change agents who will be successful in real schools of need. Teacher educators, as well as these highly supported beginning teachers, must accept the responsibility and use these experiences to improve schooling, teaching, and teacher education. We need to operationalize these learnings and

---

[6]National Center for Education Statistics, Unpublished tabulations from the *Schools and Staffing Surveys, 1993-94* (Washington, DC: national Data Resources Center, 1995); Emily Feistritzer, *Alternative Teacher Certification: A State-by-State Analysis* (Washington, DC: National Center for Education Information, 1990).

increase the numbers of educators who are efficacious as social justice educators. These people need to be socialized so that they see themselves as teacher educators as well as change agents.

By becoming integrated into an on-going cycle of teacher education, using Ochs' (1991), novice-expert framework, beginning teachers can support novice teachers and positively impact the resources needed in this area. By socializing beginning teachers in ways so that they see themselves as part of a movement promoting teacher education, we can keep them in the network and call on them in various capacities to participate in future exemplary teacher education programs. I will describe this vision in greater detail with the hope of not only improving this small, alternative, experimental program, but also in ways that addresses the needs of the profession. However, before describing the vision I will lay a foundation of understanding in order to help justify my recommendations.

We can understand the complexity of the problem by re-examining the forces that act upon beginning teachers. First, the novice teachers in general, come from traditional backgrounds where they were successful students. Next, we can assume that most beginning teachers will begin their teaching profession in traditional school environments. Finally, it is important to realize that most parents want these traditional outcomes and practices, typically measured by scores in standardized, short-answer tests. I have shown how dealing with cognitive dissonance is a powerful factor, probably powerful enough to wash out supportive components of an otherwise exemplary teacher education program. It is not enough to teach social reconstructivist and constructivist pedagogies and train beginning teachers in these practices. It is important that teacher education programs help beginning teachers to critically analyze and understand traditional norms, not only to arm them to defend the alternative beliefs and practices that they are being trained in, but also to develop the abilities to negotiate intellectual differences. Through inquiry, and other

forms of dialogue, beginning social justice educators can develop their skills to promote interpersonal communication, understandings, and negotiated agreements in beliefs and practices.

I am arguing that participants in these privileged programs have responsibilities. The graduates have responsibilities to become lifelong teacher educators. It should be articulated in the recruitment materials that these two years of high-level professional development carry with it the responsibility to help others become social justice educators and change agents. The two-year teacher education program has a responsibility to provide much better training than other programs that require fewer resources of time and money. Assuring promising placements is vital. It starts with only accepting school-university relationships where both institutions not only agree on the pedagogical vision, but also agree to an on-going process for communication and dialogue to monitor improvement, evaluate, and take action to insure advancement towards the vision. The inquiry model becomes more inclusive -- one that I now label, collaborative, school-university-based, social reconstructivist inquiry. Regularly scheduled, facilitated inquiry keeps the focus on the social justice issues, as well as mediating and minimizing cognitive dissonance.

Give Me Two Years and I'll Make You a Social Justice Educator

I am proposing an "early start" for the participants in this two-year program. It would be viewed as a professional package that prospective teachers would pay one fee for the entire program, and this fee would not be unit-based or contingent on the amount of quarters attending university. Upon acceptance to the program, participants would agree to begin their training in early summer. They would spend their days observing in year-round schools of most need, and in the afternoons follow the youngsters as they go to the various after-school programs. This way

teacher candidates would gain first-hand experiences observing and participating without the stress of having significant responsibilities. They would experience the urban school situations like the ones that they have made a commitment to teach in, and they will develop initial understandings of schools the way they are.

In the afternoons beginning teacher candidates would see the same children in settings that increase the probability that the youngsters would be at their best. Instead of observing typical, reluctant elementary students, the teaching candidates would witness boys and girls in after-school recreational, creative, and athletic settings that maximize their best qualities. This would help to imprint positive images in the minds of these, soon-to-be novice teachers. Once or twice a week teacher candidates would have an evening seminar where they would learn about the wonderful things that are being done to promote social justice education in exemplary schools. They would read from Possible Lives, (Rose, 1995), and other readings (Meier, 1995; Zeichner, 1993) that would expand their awareness of the finest efforts in social reconstructivist and constructivist pedagogy in the schools of greatest need. Teachers from professional development schools like Dewey would team with university faculty and recent teacher education program graduates to conduct this seminar.

Novice teachers would be in their field placements meeting with teachers at the school sites the week before the school year starts.[7] The teacher education program would place the highest priority on developing partnerships with schools that have the highest per percentage of teachers on emergency credentials. These are the schools that need highly qualified teachers with the skills and inclinations to be social justice educators. Serving the schools of greatest need helps to justify the large amounts of resources that go into this type of program. In order for a school to

[7]Since many of the schools of greatest need are currently on year-round calendars, teacher education programs now have more flexibility in designing the sequence of their programs.

qualify to participate in this partnership, both sides must successfully negotiate, not only the pedagogical vision, but also the implementation of that vision. A system must be agreed upon that insures on-going dialogue, with action cycles of collaborative, school-university inquiry that keeps the renewal process moving forward. This includes a spiraling model of reflection, action research, and evaluation.

Developing an inquiry-based symmetric, symbiotic, PDS/SUP, with a "third space," which includes a director, secretariat, and budget, is still the best model (Goodlad, 1994), I know of to mediate cognitive dissonance. Without constructing this safe environment to talk about issues, I believe that cognitive dissonance will remain a strong factor, and the majority of students in such an enriched teacher education program will not survive with a social justice agenda in tact. There are arguments on both sides of the issue whether or not to offer a variety of placements or stay in one community for most of the novice teaching year. A balance must be achieved in giving novices adequate experiences in schools of greatest need, while also initiating them into communities of learners. Although the residency placements are a step further along into the "real world" of schooling, we must keep up assurances that adequate support is given. Partnership, collaboration, peer cohort groupings, on-site support, and other more broad-based sources of assistance should continue.

Assuming that policy-makers and teacher educators are convinced to pursue this vision, the next question becomes where to focus the energy to make it happen. I have presented research and data that confirm the difficulties of operationalizing a symmetric, symbiotic, PDS/SUP. Perhaps it is too formidable a task to endeavor to develop the partnership and reinvent teacher training simultaneously. Is it advisable, or even possible to focus all resources and energies on implementing this partnership-through-inquiry model, and have it firmly established before re-

introducing teacher training? In other words, should the university work with targeted districts to develop relationships where mutual needs are addressed, before introducing teacher training as a second component? The aim would be for all parties to address deeply held beliefs that may not be identified as such, and to insure that teacher education is not framed in the old modes of thinking and acting. Anything that is a temptation to fall back to the old ways of thinking is something that would initially be avoided.

I do not go along with this line of thinking and rather, hold steadfast to my conviction that a reinvention of teacher education and school renewal should be proceed simultaneously. I do not know how a PDS/SUP could proceed without the inclusion of the beginning teachers. After all, the object of all this is to simultaneously train beginning teachers to be social justice educators and change agents. I believe that beginning teachers have much to gain participating as constructivist "pioneers" in experimental, alternative programs, even with all the flaws and rough edges. Given the current demand, schools of education cannot turn their backs on the need *now* to provide well trained teachers.

If anything has to go on the "back burner" while the true partnership develops, perhaps it should be the broader support components that I discussed earlier. Again, it is cognitive dissonance that has the power to wash out everything else, and I assert that the complete PDS/SUP model is the most promising way to minimize the discord. Reasonable agreement on the beliefs and implementation of practices will go a long way towards successfully supporting beginning teachers, so that they may not need so much support in other areas, or they may be strong enough to provide themselves with the support they need.

In the case of the current study, I believe that the school participants did not experience the complete PDS/SUP model. They perceived an unbalanced relationship where the schools still served and responded to the needs and

structures of the university. In an exemplary situation, school practitioners would be more involved in the planning and organization of the program. For example, practitioners working with faculty can create experiences where resident teacher portfolio development becomes more integrated into the on-going school experience. A good place to start would be expanding the use of technology so that portfolio evidence would also be on CD ROM, video tape, and computer disk. This would allow inclusion of evidence of curriculum development, so that the actual materials could be downloaded and examined, and even used by future students or other teacher educators. It would also show evidence of classroom activities in a more realistic, in-depth manner.

Breaking down isolation and maximizing collaboration is another characteristic of this vision for teacher education. This study has shown how even in supportive, collaborative programs, beginning teachers can feel alone and without hope. Programs like Center X can work to maximize the possibility that all of their professional programs seamlessly interweave to support each other. This can happen by using social justice education as the connecting thread linking educational leaders throughout Center X's programs -- school leaders in the Educational Leadership, Ed. D. program, novice administrators in an M. Ed./Administrative Credential Program, school-based mentor teachers, recent graduates, and beginning teachers. Connections would be deliberately made so that when beginning teachers have problems, they will know that there are people to go to with different levels of experience and position, that share their beliefs.

Beginning teachers have acknowledged support they get from their peers and from recent graduates. They feel safer talking to people of similar age and experience. Yet they would also benefit tremendously by becoming associated in non-evaluative ways with mentor teachers on their own campus who articulate their alignment with social reconstructivist and constructivist pedagogy. Connections

should also be made between beginning teachers and principals or assistant superintendents on other campuses that are also in, or recent graduates from, Center X leadership programs, and who hold similar thoughts and feelings. It could benefit the educational leaders because they would be gaining real experiences grappling with the most challenging issues facing teacher education. Novice administrators would advance their professional development with hands-on training by participating in the supervision and training of beginning teachers. This is another example of the potential of a symbiotic relationship, a value-added, integrated component, showing reciprocal learning.

University faculty have a very important role in mediating cognitive dissonance and helping beginning teachers balance and navigate through the school and university cultures. It makes a big difference to the beginning teachers when they know that their professors are responsive. E-mail facilitates the possibility for needed on-going dialogue. Students, especially in stressful situations, gain tremendous support when they feel that their professors are caring and attentive to their needs. This is an area where (graduate student) team leaders can be of great help to the faculty. Faculty and team leaders should be seen as a closely connected pair, collaborating on research projects which are based on the experiences in the schools where they are involved. They should deepen their collaborative relationship, maximize their presence on school campuses, and try to schedule classes and seminars in the public school classrooms. The aim would be to keep the social justice agenda alive, by integrating into the novice teaching seminar inquiry focused on dialogues about grappling with the teacher culture, the school culture, and the philosophy of teaching. Being attentive to the power of symbolism can pay off in increased confidence and empowerment of the beginning teachers. Gradually the faculty could wean the beginning teachers to channel more of their needs through the team leaders.

For the Good of All

Components of this specialized, privileged program need to be made accessible to other teacher educators to assist their efforts in teacher training and professional development, even if they cannot, or choose not to implement all of the recommendations. Continued self studies should be designed in ways that would lead to making parts of this program effective as stand-alones. On-going efforts need to continue so that the learnings from this experimental program are available to the various publics. There is little doubt that UCLA will continue to produce and disseminate traditional, academically based research on the various activities associated with Center X. However, more is needed beyond the books and articles in the scholarly domain. Successful school-university collaborations should produce popular publications, in the practitioner and in the mainstream medias. Monthly PDS/SUP one-page newsletters would keep the participants and the public aware of the advancements, yet not require too great a commitment for the reader as well as the publisher.

Efforts should be made to coordinate public events in the communities that bring together all constituencies in the social justice dialogue. School board members and union leaders should be kept up-to-date on the theory and practice, and be invited to take active leadership roles supporting collaborative activities that promote social justice, school-university partnership, and teacher education. Support from school boards can be enhanced by regular communication, such as newsletters, and shared meetings or inviting participation in public events. Partnership schools should be regular presenters at the beginning of board meetings and children's and novice teachers' work should adorn school board offices. It is in the union's interests to protect their constituencies. The majority of their active membership are the veteran teachers whose practices we are trying to change. We

need to learn better ways of enlisting the support of the union so that we can work side-by-side renewing education in ways that promote change, yet do not minimize the value of veteran teachers or disrespect the work that they have dedicated their careers to.

These are important relationships, and by bringing together various groups of people, service agencies, institutes of higher learning, school boards, unions, and school-based practitioners, with each one doing what they do best, the greater good will be served. Linda Darling-Hammond (1997) warns against devoting too great a portion of scarce resources to top-level management, however, this case and other PDS/SUP studies confirm the importance of having a full-time coordinator and staff in this "third space." It is important to insure effective, broad-based communication that support the various constituencies working together collaboratively, while at the same time protecting their self-interests.

Areas for Future Study

I am intrigued about continuing the longitudinal study. Nancy and Lucy have returned to Ocean View, Tina stayed at Dewey, and Lois after being undecided relocated to Northern California and gave teaching one more try. A continued exploration into their professional lives could yield deeper understandings about how their beliefs and practices regarding survival are influenced by their work context. A paradoxical question emerges. Will there be more evidence of social reconstructivist and/or constructivist pedagogies in their practices when Nancy and Lucy return to the supportive, progressive school, and move away from schools of need? Other questions would emerge in a continued exploration of their development as social justice educators. Will Tina, (and Nancy and Lucy, if they regain their success), expand their responsibilities and participate in a network of teacher educators? If Lois stays in the profession, what kind of school will she work

in, and in what ways will her beliefs and practices develop? As all four become more experienced teachers will they continue to be reflective practitioners, and will they become involved more actively in the study as co-researchers?

A variation on the above study would be to explore the influence of exemplary schools on the development of beginning teachers as social justice educators. Researchers may be interested in looking at a cohort of beginning teachers with a novice year at Dewey and a residency year elsewhere (at a school of need). They may want to compare beginning teachers with a program of varied field experiences verses the two year experience Tina had in one learning community. Continuing the longitudinal study, or focusing on the exemplary learning community at Dewey would yield interesting findings about best case scenarios, but these studies would not expand the knowledge base about how to develop beginning teachers with the skills and inclinations to be social justice educators in the schools of need. This concern stimulates thoughts to other avenues of research.

More study is needed exploring teacher education programs that seek a balance of field experiences, in schools restructured to promote the way we want schooling to be, as well as in traditionally organized schools that are currently the norm. We need to learn more about how to provide structures so that beginning teachers experience the vision and also live the experiences necessary to be strong enough to survive in the most challenging schools. These case studies would examine beginning teachers gaining real-life field experiences in renewed schools, and explore how participating in actual social reconstructivist and constructivist practices, affects their development as social justice educators. On the one hand, they need these real life experiences operationalizing the vision. The danger is that if the setting is too ideal, teacher education programs would not succeed in nurturing the beginning teachers to be inclined or skilled to teach in the schools of most need. More study is needed in schools with populations that are not diverse -- inner city

schools filled primarily with low-income African-American and/or Latino children. We need to learn more about creating the conditions in these settings, that promote exemplary schools, engaged in inquiry, and aligned with social reconstructivist pedagogical theory. We need to learn more about teaching students who are different from the teacher. In addition to continuing Marilyn Cochran-Smith's line of inquiry into racial differences between teacher and students (Cochran-Smith, 1995a; Cochran-Smith, 1995b), it is important to also learn more about negotiating differences and developing common understandings about pedagogy. Studies of this nature would be aimed at mediating cognitive dissonance and helping practitioners communicate with traditional school communities and work together satisfactorily without compromising the important social justice agenda.

The current shortage of qualified teachers stimulates another line of study that is urgently needed. Alternative, "fast-track" credentialing programs are designed to address the current teacher shortage, as well as provide adequate training. Studies like mine imply that teacher education programs need to provide more for beginning teachers, yet alternative credentialing programs offer condensed, on-the-job training, while their students are beginning teachers in the most challenging schools. Teacher educators and policy makers need to become more highly informed about designing and implementing teacher education programs that fill the need quickly, while accommodating these beginning teachers with effective training.

This does not mean all teacher education programs should be "fast-track." Two year programs, like the one Center X offers, provide much more training, support, and preparation. It is important that those who offer these two year programs learn more about communicating the advantages of their programs, and target those beginning teachers who clearly want to make the human and financial commitment to be fully prepared to become social justice educators in the schools of

greatest need. These programs are asking a great deal from prospective teaching candidates, who can choose among the many credentialing routes available today. It is important that programs like Center X continually critically examine their offerings in the spirit of steady renewal and improvement. The need has never been greater, and the opportunity has never been greater, resulting in plenty of attention currently being focused on both pre-service and in-service teacher preparation. As the gap between the rich and poor widens, the children in the urban schools suffer. We must intensify our efforts to support those who teach in urban schools -- inner city schools filled primarily with low-income African-American and/or Latino children, many of whom English is not their first language. We need to learn more about creating the conditions in these settings, that promote exemplary schools, engaged in inquiry, and aligned with social reconstructivist pedagogical theory. We need to fill these schools with highly qualified, well trained teachers, with the skills and inclinations to dedicate their professional careers to social justice education.

References

Apple, M. W. (1982). *Education and Power*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Banfield, E. C. (1970). *The Unheavenly City: The Nature and Future of Our Urban Crisis*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.

Book, C. L. (1996). Professional Development Schools. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education: A Project of the Association of Teacher Educators* (Second Edition ed., pp. 194 - 210). New York, NY.: Macmillan.

Cantor, J. S. (1997). *Support For Developing Beginning Teachers As Social Justice Educators In the Context of a School-University Partnership*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1995a). Color Blindness and Basket Making Are Not the Answers: Confronting the Dilemmas of Race, Culture, and Language Diversity in Teacher Education. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 493-522.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1995b). Uncertain Allies: Understanding the Boundaries of Race and Teaching. *Harvard Educational Review, 65*(4), 541-570.

Counts, G. (1932). *Dare the schools build a new social order?* New York, NY.: The John Day Co.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). *Professional Development Schools: Schools for Developing a Profession*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *The Right To Learn: A Blueprint for Creating Schools That Work*. San Francisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). Teachers and Teaching: Testing Policy Hypotheses From a National Commission Report. *Educational Researcher, 27*(1), 5-15.

Dudley, N. Q. (1992). Participatory Principles in Human Inquiry: Ethics and Methods in a Study of the Paradigm Shift Experience. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 5*(4), 325 - 344.

Freire, P. (1968). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Herder and Herder.

Giroux, H., & McLaren, P. (1987). Teacher Education and the Politics of Engagement: The Case for Democratic Schooling. In M. Okazawa-Ray, J.

Anderson, & R. Traver (Eds.), *Teaching, Teachers, and Teacher Education* (pp. 157 --182). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Educational Review Reprint.

Giroux, H. A. (1981). *Ideology, Culture and the Process of Schooling*. Basingstoke: Falmer Press.

Gold, Y. (1996). Beginning Teacher Support. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (Second Edition ed., pp. 548 -594). New York, N.Y.: Macmillan.

Gold, Y., & Roth, R. A. (1993). *Teachers managing stress and preventing burnout: The professional health solution*. london: Falmer Press.

Goodlad, J. I. (1990). *Teachers For Our Nation's Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goodlad, J. I. (1994). *Educational Renewal: Better Teachers, Better Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gutierrez, K. D., & Meyer, B. (1995). Creating Communities of Effective Practice: Building Literacy for Language Minority Students. In J. Oakes & K. H. Quartz (Eds.), *Creating New Educational Communities* (pp. 32 - 52). Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.

Heckman, P. E., Confer, C. B., & Peacock, J. (1995). Democracy in a Multicultural School and Community. In J. Oakes, and Quartz, Karen Hunter (Ed.), *Creating New Educational Communities* (94 ed., pp. 187-201). Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.

Holmes, Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's Schools: Principles for the Design of Professional Development Schools* . East Lansing, MI.: The Holmes Group, Inc.

Hunkins, F. P., Wiseman, D. L., & Williams, R. C. (1995). Supporting Collaborative Inquiry. In R. T. Osguthorpe, R. C. Harris, M. F. Harris, & S. Black (Eds.), *Partner Schools: Centers for Educational Renewal* (Vol. 1, pp. 99 - 123). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kohl, P. L., & Witty, E. P. (1996). Equity Challenges. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education: A Project of the Association of Teacher Educators* (Second Edition ed., pp. 837 --866). New York, NY.: Macmillan.

Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage Inequalities: Children in America's Schools*. New York, N.Y.: Crown.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA.: Sage.

Liston, D. P., & Zeichner, K. M. (1991). *Teacher Education and the Social Conditions of Schooling*. New York, NY.: Routledge.

Meier, D. (1995). *The Power of Their Ideas: Lessons for America From a Small School in Harlem*. Boston: Beacon Press.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future* . New York, New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality*. New Haven, CT.: Yale University Press.

Oakes, J. (1990). *Multiplying Inequalities: The effects of race, social class, and tracking on opportunities to learn mathematics and science* . Santa Monica, CA.: Rand.

Oakes, J. (1996). Making the Rhetoric Real. *Multicultural Education*(Winter), 4-10.

Oakes, J., Beck, L., & Mitchell, T. (1996). Teachers for Urban Schools and Communities: An Inquiry-Based Teacher Education Collaboration Between UCLA and Santa Monica Schools (pp. 25). Los Angeles, CA.

Ochs, E. (1991). Socialization Through Language and Interaction: A Theoretical Introduction. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 2*(2), 143-154.

Reason, P. (1994). Three Approaches to Participative Inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 324 - 339). Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage.

Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in Thinking*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rose, M. (1995). *Possible Lives: The Promise of Public Education in America*. New York, NY.: Penguin Books.

Rugg, H. (1931). *Culture and education in Amereica*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co.

Rugg, H. (1952). *The teacher of teachers*. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers.

Sirotnik, K., A., & Oakes, J. (1986). Critical Inquiry For School Renewal: Liberating Theory and Practice. In K. Sirotnik, A. & J. Oakes (Eds.), *Critical Perspectives*

on the Organization and Improvement of Schooling (pp. 3 - 93). Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff.

Sleeter, C., Grant, C. (1987). An Analysis of multicultural education in the U.S. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*, 421-444.

Su, Z. (1990). Exploring the Moral Socialisation of Teacher Candidates [1]. *Oxford Review of Education, Vol. 16, No. 3*, 367 - 391.

Su, Z. (1992). Sources of Influence in Preservice Teacher Socialization. *Journal of Education for Teaching, Vol. 18, No. 3*, 239 - 257.

Valli, L., Cooper, D., Frankes, L., & Zeichner, K. C. E. (1997). Professional Development Schools and Equity. In M. W. Apple (Ed.), *Review of Research In Education* (Vol. 22, pp. 251-304). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Wasley, P. A., King, S. P., & Louth, C. (1995). Creating Coalition Schools through Collaborative Inquiry. In J. Oakes & K. H. Quartz (Eds.), *Creating New Educational Communities: Ninety-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 202 - 223). Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.

Zeichner, K. M. (1993). Connecting Genuine Teacher Development to the Struggle for Social Justice. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 19*(No. 1), 5 - 20.

Zeichner, K. M., & Gore, J. M. (1990). Teacher Socialization. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (pp. 329 - 348). New York: Macmillan.

Zeichner, K. M., & Hoeft, K. (1996). Teacher Socialization For Cultural Diversity. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education: A Project of the Association of Teacher Educators* (Second Edition ed., pp. 525 - 547). New York, NY.: Macmillan.